REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 22-25 and leaves claims 28-33 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 22-25 and 28-33.

The present Amendment is being filed so as to clarify the language in the claims as agreed during a telephone interview with the Examiner on even date. Particularly, the present Amendment clarifies that the present claims are directed to the third embodiment of the present invention as discussed in the present application on page 30, line 10 through page 32, line 8 and as illustrated in Fig. 11.

As discussed in the above noted passage of the present application the auxiliary information 301 include a processing time 1003 value which is a predetermined period of time representing a processing end time as calculated from a processing start time, when execution of the program or script has been started. The processing time 1003 value as discussed provides unique advantages over the prior art of record since it allows for data that may not have been generated properly to not be displayed if the generation of said data resulting from execution of said the program or script does not occur prior to the processing end time.

According to the present invention if the data resulting from execution of said the program or script has not been generated by the processing end time, then the assumption is something may be wrong the execution of the program or script. If something is wrong the execution of the program or script, then according to the present invention the apparatus is switched to play back the video and audio data of the received broadcast information,

thereby avoiding the display of what may be corrupted data and a delay in the broadcast program.

As argued during the interview, the above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Olivo, or Shimoji whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, since each of Olivo and Shimoji fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, combining Olivo with Shimoji does not render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of the claims as being unpatentable over Olivo in combination with Shimoji is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (501.37519X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120